arXiv:1505.03596v1 [math.AP] 14 May 2015

On the vanishing resistivity limit and the magnetic boundary-layers for one-dimensional compressible magnetohydrodynamics*

Song Jiang[1]†, **Jianwen Zhang**[2]‡

[1] Institute of Applied Physics and Computational Mathematics,
P.O. Box 8009, Beijing 100088, China

[2] School of Mathematical Sciences, Xiamen University, Xiamen 361005, China

Abstract. We consider an initial-boundary value problem for the one-dimensional equations of compressible isentropic viscous and non-resistive magnetohydrodynamic flows. The global well-posedness of strong solutions with general large data is established. Moreover, the vanishing resistivity limit is justified and the thickness of magnetic boundary layers is analyzed. The proofs of these results are based on a full use of the so-called "effective viscous flux", the material derivative and the structure of the equations.

Key words. Compressible MHD equations, vanishing resistivity limit, magnetic boundary layers, global well-posedness, initial-boundary value problem

AMS Subject Classifications (2000): 35M10, 35Q60, 76N10, 76N17, 76N20.

1 Introduction

Magnetohydrodynamics (MHD) concerns the motion of a conducting fluids in an electromagnetic field and has a very wide range of applications in astrophysics, plasma, and so on. Because the dynamic motion of the fluids and the magnetic field interacts strongly on each other, both the hydrodynamic and electrodynamic effects have to be considered. The three-dimensional equations for compressible isentropic magnetohydrodynamic flows, derived from fluid mechanics with appropriate modifications to account for electrical forces, read as follows (see [3, 18]):

$$\begin{cases} \rho_t + \mathrm{div}(\rho \mathbf{u}) = 0, \\ (\rho \mathbf{u})_t + \mathrm{div}(\rho \mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}) + \nabla P = \mu \Delta \mathbf{u} + (\mu + \lambda') \nabla \mathrm{div} \mathbf{u} + (\nabla \times \mathbf{B}) \times \mathbf{B}, \\ \mathbf{B}_t - \nabla \times (\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{B}) = -\nu \nabla \times (\nabla \times \mathbf{B}), \quad \mathrm{div} \mathbf{B} = 0 \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

with $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ and $t \geq 0$. Here, the unknown functions $\rho, \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^3, P$ and $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ are the density of fluid, velocity, pressure, and magnetic field, respectively. The viscosity coefficients μ

---

*Supported by the National Basic Research Program under the grant 2011CB309705, NSFC (Grant Nos. 11271306, 11229101, 11371065) and the Beijing Center for Mathematics and Information Interdisciplinary Sciences.

†Email: jiang@iapcm.ac.cn

‡Email: jwzhang@xmu.edu.cn (Corresponding author)

and λ' satisfy the physical conditions $\mu > 0, 3\lambda' + 2\mu \geq 0$. The constant $\nu > 0$ is the resistivity coefficient which is inversely proportional to the electrical conductivity constant (magnetic Reynolds number) and acts as the diffusivity coefficient of the magnetic fields. The pressure $P(\rho)$ is generally determined through the equation of state (the so-called γ-law):

$$P(\rho) \triangleq A\rho^{\gamma} \quad \text{with} \quad A > 0, \gamma > 1. \tag{1.2}$$

Equations (1.1), (1.2) describe the macroscopic behavior of electrically conducting compressible (isentropic) fluids in a magnetic field. From Eq. $(1.1)_3$ it is clear that the time rate of change of the magnetic field (i.e., $\mathbf{B}_t$) is dominated by both the advection term $\nabla \times (\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{B})$ and the diffusion term $\nu \nabla \times (\nabla \times \mathbf{B})$. However, in many cosmical and geophysical problems where the conducting fluid is of extremely high conductivity (ideal conductors), the resistivity ν is inversely proportional to the electrical conductivity σ, and therefore, it is more rational to assume that there is no magnetic diffusion (i.e. $\nu = 0$) (see, for example, [4, 9]). So, instead of $(1.1)_3$, the induction equation for magnetic field in such cases has the form:

$$\mathbf{B}_t - \nabla \times (\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{B}) = 0,$$

which particularly implies that in a highly conducting fluid the magnetic field lines move along exactly with the fluid, rather than simply diffusing out. This type of behavior is physically expressed as that *the magnetic field lines are frozen into the fluid.* In effect, the fluid can flow freely along the magnetic field lines, but any motion of the conducting fluid, perpendicular to the field lines, carries them with the fluid. The "frozen-in" nature of magnetic fields plays very important roles and has a very wide range of applications in both astrophysics and nuclear fusion theory, where the magnetic Reynolds number $R_m \sim 1/\nu$ is usually very high. A typical illustration of the "frozen-in" behavior is the phenomenon of sunspots. For more details of its physical background and applications, we refer to [1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 13, 18, 19].

Formally, when $\nu = 0$, system (1.1) turns into

$$\begin{cases} \rho_t + \operatorname{div}(\rho\mathbf{u}) = 0, \\ (\rho\mathbf{u})_t + \operatorname{div}(\rho\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}) + \nabla P = \mu\Delta\mathbf{u} + (\mu + \lambda')\nabla\operatorname{div}\mathbf{u} + (\nabla \times \mathbf{B}) \times \mathbf{B}, \\ \mathbf{B}_t - \nabla \times (\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{B}) = 0, \quad \operatorname{div}\mathbf{B} = 0, \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

where the pressure $P(\rho)$ satisfies the γ-law (1.2). This is often called the compressible isentropic viscous and non-resistive MHD equations.

Because of the complete interaction between the dynamic motion and the magnetic field, the strong nonlinear terms and the lack of dissipation mechanism of the magnetic field, many physically important and mathematically fundamental problems of system (1.3) are still open. For example, to the author's knowledge, there is no any rigorously mathematical literature on the global well-posedness of the initial (boundary) value problem of (1.3), even that the initial data are close to a non-vacuum equilibrium, though the same problem has been successfully solved for the compressible Navier-Stokes equations (i.e., $\mathbf{B} = 0$) by Matsumura-Nishida [23].

Due to the complicated structure of multi-dimensional equations, instead of (1.1) and (1.3), in this paper we shall consider the simplest one-dimensional equations (cf. [12]):

$$\begin{cases} \rho_t + (\rho u)_x = 0, \\ (\rho u)_t + \left(\rho u^2 + P(\rho) + \dfrac{1}{2}b^2\right)_x = \lambda u_{xx}, \\ b_t + (ub)_x = \nu b_{xx}, \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \rho_t + (\rho u)_x = 0, \\ (\rho u)_t + \left(\rho u^2 + P(\rho) + \dfrac{1}{2}b^2\right)_x = \lambda u_{xx}, \\ b_t + (ub)_x = 0, \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

where the pressure $P(\rho)$ obeys the γ-law (1.2) and $\lambda = 2\mu + \lambda'$.

Indeed, assume that the MHD flow is moving only in the longitudinal direction x and uniform in the transverse directions (y, z). Then it is easy to derive (1.4) and (1.5) from (1.1) and (1.3), respectively, based on the specific choice of dependent variables:

$$\rho = \rho(x,t), \quad \mathbf{u} = (u(x,t), 0, 0), \quad \mathbf{B} = (0, 0, b(x,t)).$$

We mention here that the one-dimensional system for compressible heat-conductive viscous and resistive MHD flows in a form similar to that in (1.4) was studied by Kazhikhov-Smagulov [17], where the global well-posedness of solutions was announced.

The main purpose of this paper is to show the global well-posedness of strong solutions to an initial-boundary value problem of the system (1.5), to justify the vanishing resistivity limit (i.e., $\nu \to 0$) from (1.4) to (1.5) rigorously, and to study the boundary layer effects as $\nu \to 0$. To do so, without loss of generality, we consider an initial-boundary value problem of (1.5) on a bounded spatial-domain $\Omega \triangleq (0,1)$ with the following initial and boundary data:

$$\begin{cases} (\rho, u, b)(x, 0) = (\rho_0, u_0, b_0)(x), \quad x \in [0,1], \\ u(0,t) = u(1,t) = 0, \quad t \geq 0. \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

Our first result concerns the global well-posedness of strong solutions to the initial-boundary value problem (1.5), (1.6).

Theorem 1.1 *Assume that the initial data (ρ_0, u_0, b_0) given in (1.6) satisfies*

$$\inf_{0\leq x\leq 1} \rho_0(x) > 0, \quad (\rho_0, b_0) \in H^1, \quad u_0 \in H_0^1 \cap H^2. \tag{1.7}$$

Then for any $0 < T < \infty$, there exists a global unique strong solution (ρ, u, b) to the initial-boundary value problem (1.5), (1.6) on $[0,1] \times [0,T)$, satisfying

$$0 < C^{-1} \leq \rho(x,t) \leq C < \infty, \quad \forall\ (x,t) \in [0,1] \times [0,T) \tag{1.8}$$

for some positive constant C, and

$$\begin{cases} (\rho, b) \in L^\infty(0,T; H^1), \quad (\rho_t, b_t) \in L^\infty(0,T; L^2), \\ u \in L^\infty(0,T; H_0^1 \cap H^2), \quad u_t \in L^\infty(0,T; L^2) \cap L^2(0,T; H^1). \end{cases} \tag{1.9}$$

Theorem 1.1 is the first result on the global well-posedness theory of the non-resistive MHD equations with large data. It particularly implies that the solutions of the viscous and non-resistive MHD problem (1.5), (1.6) will not develop vacuum and mass concentration in finite time provided the initial data are bounded and smooth, and do not contain vacuum.

It is worth pointing out that the equations (1.5) look similar to a compressible model for gas and liquid two-phase fluids (see, for example, [29, 6]). However, to prove the global well-posedness of the two-phase model, it is technically assumed in [29, 6] that the proportion between the mass of gas and liquid must be bounded, in analogy to the assumptions $\rho, b \geq 0$ and $0 \leq b/\rho < \infty$ for (1.5). Of course, this is somewhat reasonable for the two-phase model, but not physical and realistic in magnetohydrodynamics.

The second purpose of this paper is to justify the vanishing resistivity limit from (1.4) to (1.5) rigorously, as the resistivity coefficient $\nu \to 0$. More precisely,

Theorem 1.2 *(i) Suppose that system (1.4) is equipped with initial and boundary data:*

$$\begin{cases} (\rho, u, b)(x, 0) = (\rho_0, u_0, b_0)(x), \quad x \in [0, 1], \\ u(0, t) = u(1, t) = 0, \quad b(0, t) = b_1(t), \quad b(1, t) = b_2(t), \quad t \geq 0. \end{cases} \tag{1.10}$$

For any $0 < T < \infty$, *assume that*

$$\inf_{0 \leq x \leq 1} \rho_0(x) > 0, \quad (\rho_0, b_0) \in H^1, \quad (b_1, b_2) \in C^1([0, T)), \quad u_0 \in H_0^1. \tag{1.11}$$

Then the initial-boundary value problem (1.4), (1.10) has a global unique strong solution (ρ, u, b) *on* $[0, 1] \times [0, T)$, *satisfying*

$$0 < C^{-1} \leq \rho(x, t) \leq C < \infty, \quad \forall\ (x, t) \in [0, 1] \times [0, T) \tag{1.12}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{0 \leq t < T} \left(\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \nu^{1/2} \|\rho_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{1/2} \|b_x\|_{L^2}^2 \right)(t) \\ &\qquad + \int_0^T \left(\|\rho^{1/2} \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{3/2} \|b_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{1/2} \|b b_x\|_{L^2}^2 \right) dt \leq C, \end{aligned} \tag{1.13}$$

where C *is a positive constant independent of* ν.

(ii) Assume that (ρ^ν, u^ν, b^ν) *and* (ρ, u, b), *defined on* $[0, 1] \times [0, T)$, *are the solutions of the problems (1.4), (1.10) and (1.5), (1.6), respectively. Then,*

$$\begin{cases} (\rho^\nu, u^\nu, b^\nu) \to (\rho, u, b) \quad \textit{strongly in} \quad L^\infty(0, T; L^2), \\ \nu b_x^\nu \to 0, \quad u_x^\nu \to u_x \quad \textit{strongly in} \quad L^2(0, T; L^2), \end{cases}$$

and moreover, there exists a positive constant C, *independent of* ν, *such that for* $\nu \in (0, 1)$,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t < T} \left(\|\rho^\nu - \rho\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b^\nu - b\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u^\nu - u\|_{L^2}^2 \right)(t) + \int_0^T \|(u^\nu - u)_x\|_{L^2}^2 dt \leq C \nu^{1/2}. \tag{1.14}$$

The third and main result of this paper is to study the effects of magnetic boundary layer as the resistivity coefficient $\nu \to 0$. In fact, it is obvious that when the resistivity coefficient goes to zero, the parabolic equation $(1.4)_3$ turns into the hyperbolic equation $(1.5)_3$, and the boundaries become characteristic due to the non-slip boundary conditions $u|_{x=0,1} = 0$. Thus, by the classical theory in [24], one has to drop the boundary conditions of the magnetic field in (1.10) (cp. (1.6)), and consequently, because of the disparity of boundary conditions, we cannot expect that as $\nu \to 0$, the solution of the problem (1.4), (1.10) will tend to the one of the problem (1.5), (1.6) uniformly up to the boundaries $x = 0, 1$. In other words, a (magnetic) boundary layer appears near the boundary.

Similar to the relations among the Euler, Navier-Stokes and Prandtl equations (see, for example, [20, 25, 26]), it is expected that as $\nu \to 0$, the solution of the problem (1.4), (1.10) converges uniformly to the solution of the problem (1.5), (1.6) away from the boundaries, while there is a sharp change of gradient near the boundary. Inspired by this, we introduce the concept of magnetic boundary-layer thickness (MBL-thickness) as follows.

Definition 1.1 *A non-negative function $\delta(\nu)$ is called a MBL-thickness of the problem (1.4), (1.10) with vanishing resistivity limit, if $\delta(\nu) \downarrow 0$ as $\nu \downarrow 0$, and*

$$\lim_{\nu\to 0} \|(\rho^\nu - \rho, u^\nu - u, b^\nu - b)\|_{L^\infty(0,T;C(\overline{\Omega}_{\delta(\nu)}))} = 0, \tag{1.15}$$

$$\liminf_{\nu\to 0} \|(\rho^\nu - \rho, u^\nu - u, b^\nu - b)\|_{L^\infty(0,T;C(\overline{\Omega}))} > 0 \tag{1.16}$$

with $\Omega_\delta \triangleq \{x \in \Omega \mid \delta < x < 1-\delta\}$. Here, (ρ^ν, u^ν, b^ν) and (ρ, u, b) are the solutions of the problems (1.4), (1.10) and (1.5), (1.6), respectively.

The concept of boundary-layer thickness (BL-thickness) has been introduced in [10, 15] in a similar manner for the one-dimensional cylindrical compressible Navier-Stokes equations with vanishing shear viscosity limit. The BL-thickness for the scalar conservation laws and the 2D Boussinesq equations with vanishing diffusivity limit was also studied in [11] and [16], respectively. It is worth mentioning that Definition 1.1 does not determine the MBL-thickness uniquely, since any function $\delta_1(\nu)$, satisfying $\delta_1(\nu) \ge \delta(\nu)$ and $\delta_1(\nu) \downarrow 0$ as $\nu \downarrow 0$, is also a MBL-thickness. Thus, there should exist a minimal MBL-thickness $\delta_*(\nu)$ which may be considered as the true MBL-thickness.

In this paper, we shall prove that a function $\delta_n(\nu) = \nu^{1/2-1/n}$ with $n > 2$ is a MBL-thickness in the sense of Definition 1.1. This is somewhat in agreement with the famous Stokes-Blasius law in the laminar boundary layer theory (see [26]), since $\liminf_{n\to\infty} \delta_n(\nu) = \nu^{1/2}$. In order to simplify the analysis of MBL-thickness, similarly to [10, 15], we shall focus on the special case of vanishing initial data. More precisely, we shall prove

Theorem 1.3 *(i) Assume that the viscous and non-resistive system (1.5) is equipped with initial and boundary data:*

$$(\rho, u, b)|_{t=0} = (\overline{\rho}, 0, 0) \quad \textit{with} \quad \overline{\rho} \equiv Const. > 0, \quad \textit{and} \quad u|_{x=0,1} = 0. \tag{1.17}$$

Then the problem (1.5), (1.17) has only a trivial solution $(\rho, u, b) = (\overline{\rho}, 0, 0)$.

(ii) Assume that (ρ, u, b) is the solution of the viscous and resistive system (1.4) with the following initial and boundary data:

$$(\rho, u, b)|_{t=0} = (\overline{\rho}, 0, 0), \quad u|_{x=0,1} = 0, \quad b(0,t) = b_1(t), \quad b(1,t) = b_2(t), \tag{1.18}$$

where $\overline{\rho} \equiv Const. > 0$ and $b_1(t), b_2(t)$ are the same as in (1.17) and (1.10), respectively. Then any function $\delta(\nu) \ge 0$, satisfying

$$\delta(\nu) \to 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \frac{\delta(\nu)}{\nu^{1/2}} \to \infty, \quad \textit{as} \quad \nu \to 0, \tag{1.19}$$

is a MBL-thickness in the sense of Definition 1.1 such that

$$\lim_{\nu\to 0} \left(\|\rho - \overline{\rho}\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;C(\overline{\Omega}_{\delta(\nu)}))} + \|b\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;C(\overline{\Omega}_{\delta(\nu)}))} \right) = 0 \tag{1.20}$$

and

$$\liminf_{\nu\to 0} \left(\|\rho - \overline{\rho}\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;C(\overline{\Omega}))} + \|b\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;C(\overline{\Omega}))} \right) > 0, \tag{1.21}$$

provided the boundary data $b_1(t), b_2(t)$ are not identically zero.

In view of Definition 1.1, we notice from (1.20) and (1.21) that there is no boundary layer effect on the velocity. This is mainly due to the smooth mechanism of the viscosity term λu_{xx} with $\lambda > 0$, and it indeed holds that (see (4.4), (4.5) below)

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T;C(\overline{\Omega}))} \to 0, \quad \text{as} \quad \nu \to 0.$$

The proofs of Theorems 1.1–1.3 will be given respectively in Sections 1, 2 and 3, based on the global (uniform-in-ν) a-priori estimates of the solutions. However, the lack of smooth mechanism of the magnetic field, the strong nonlinearities, and the interaction between dynamic motion and magnetic field will cause some serious difficulties. To circumvent these difficulties, motivated by the study of multi-dimensional Navier-Stokes/MHD equations (see, for example, [8, 22, 21]), we shall make a full use of the so-called "effective viscous flux" F and the material derivative $\dot{u}$:

$$F \triangleq \lambda u_x - P(\rho) - \frac{b^2}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{u} \triangleq u_t + uu_x. \tag{1.22}$$

It turns out that the "effective viscous flux" F possesses more regularities than the velocity.

We begin the proofs with the elementary energy estimates and the upper boundedness of the density (see Lemmas 2.1, 2.2, 3.2 and 3.3). Next, by using the special mathematical structure of F, especially, using the non-negativity of b^2 and the fact that $F_x = \rho\dot{u}$ due to $(1.4)_2$ (or $(1.5)_2$), we can improve the integrability of the magnetic field and obtain the desired bounds of $\|u_x\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}$ and $\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2)}$ (see Lemmas 2.3–2.5 and 3.4). With these estimates at hand, we then can show the boundedness of the magnetic field and the lower boundedness of the density as well (see Lemmas 2.6 and 3.5). Thus, noting that $F_x = \rho\dot{u}$, by (1.22) we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_x\|_{L^\infty} &\le C\left(\|F\|_{L^\infty} + \|P(\rho)\|_{L^\infty} + \|b^2\|_{L^\infty}\right) \le C\left(1 + \|F\|_{L^\infty}\right) \\ &\le C\left(1 + \|F\|_{L^2} + \|F_x\|_{L^2}\right) \le C\left(1 + \|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}\right) \in L^2(0,T), \end{aligned} \tag{1.23}$$

which plays a very important role in the entire analysis of this paper. Indeed, as an immediate result of (1.23) and the blowup criterion in [28], one can easily obtain the global existence of strong solutions to (1.5), (1.6) (see Section 2).

The justification of vanishing resistivity limit and the study of magnetic boundary layers are more difficult and need some more delicate estimates. Indeed, due to the presence of boundary layer effects, the global uniform-in-ν estimates for the solution (ρ, u, b) of the problem (1.4), (1.10) (also (1.4), (1.18)) are much fewer than those for the solutions of the problem (1.5), (1.6). For example, it is very difficult to obtain the global uniform (in ν) L^2-bounds of the derivatives of the density and magnetic field for the problems (1.4), (1.10) and (1.4), (1.18), compared with the uniform bounds stated in Lemma 2.7 for the problem (1.5), (1.6). Instead of (2.27), noting that

$$u_{xx} = \lambda^{-1}\left(F_x + P(\rho)_x + bb_x\right),$$

using (1.23), the estimates obtained and subtle boundary analysis, we have (cf. Lemma 3.6)

$$\nu^{1/2} \sup_{0\le t<T}\left(\|\rho_x(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b_x(t)\|_{L^2}^2\right) + \nu^{3/2}\int_0^T \|b_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 dt \le C. \tag{1.24}$$

This suffices to prove the vanishing resistivity limit and to obtain the convergence rates given in Theorem 1.2 (see Section 3).

As for the analysis of boundary layer effects, the weighted L^1-method used in [10, 15] seems difficult to apply here, due to the strong interactions of dynamic motion and magnetic field. Instead of the L^1-method, we shall make use of the weighted L^2-method to analyze the thickness of magnetic boundary layers. To do this, we first utilize the special initial data in (1.18), (1.14) and (1.24) to improve the convergence estimate of the velocity (cf. Lemma 4.1):

$$\sup_{0\le t<T}\|u_x(t)\|_{L^2}^2+\int_0^T\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2dt\le C\nu^{1/2}. \tag{1.25}$$

This particularly implies that $\|u(t)\|_{C(\overline{\Omega})}\to 0$ as $\nu\to 0$ for $t\in[0,T)$, and hence, there is no boundary layer effects on the velocity. Using (1.22), (1.24), (1.25) and the special initial data in (1.18) again, we succeed in deriving the weighted (interior) L^2-estimate (cf. Lemma 4.2):

$$\sup_{0\le t<T}\int_0^1\xi(x)\left(|\rho_x|^2+|b_x|^2\right)(x,t)dx\le C\nu^{1/2}\quad\text{with}\quad \xi(x)\triangleq x^2(1-x)^2, \tag{1.26}$$

which, together with (1.14) and Sobolev's inequality, proves Theorem 1.3 (see Section 4).

2 Global well-posedness of (1.5), (1.6)

The local existence of regular solutions with smooth initial data can be shown by the standard method based on the Banach theorem and the contractivity of the operator defined by the linearized the problem on a small time interval. The global existence of solutions will be obtained by the method of extending local solutions with respect to time based on the global a-priori estimates.

For this purpose, let (ρ,u,b) be a smooth solution of (1.5), (1.6). We will establish the necessary global a-priori estimates of (ρ,u,b) defined on $[0,1]\times[0,T)$ for any fixed $T>0$. For simplicity, we denote by C and C_i $(i=1,2,\dots)$ generic positive constants which may depend on λ,A,γ, the initial norms of (ρ_0,u_0,b_0) and T, and may change from line to line.

We begin with the conservations of mass and momentum.

Lemma 2.1 *Let (ρ,u,b) be a smooth solution of (1.5), (1.6) on $[0,1]\times[0,T)$. Then for any $0\le t<T$,*

$$0<\int_0^1\rho(x,t)dx=\int_0^1\rho_0(x)dx<\infty, \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^1\left(\frac12\rho u^2+\frac12 b^2+\frac{A}{\gamma-1}\rho^\gamma\right)(x,t)dx+\lambda\int_0^t\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2ds\\&\quad=\int_0^1\left(\frac12\rho_0u_0^2+\frac12 b_0^2+\frac{A}{\gamma-1}\rho_0^\gamma\right)(x)dx.\end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

The upper boundedness of the density can be deduced in a similar manner to that in [7].

Lemma 2.2 *Let (ρ,u,b) be a smooth solution of (1.5), (1.6) on $[0,1]\times[0,T)$. Then,*

$$0\le\rho(x,t)\le C,\quad\forall\ (x,t)\in[0,1]\times[0,T). \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. The non-negativity of the density (i.e., $\rho \geq 0$) readily follows from the method of characteristics and the fact that $\rho_0 > 0$. In the next, for completeness we sketch the proof of the upper bound below. Define

$$\psi(x,t) \triangleq \int_0^t \left(\lambda u_x - \rho u^2 - P(\rho) - \frac{b^2}{2}\right)(x,s)ds + \int_0^x (\rho_0 u_0)(\xi)d\xi. \tag{2.4}$$

Clearly, it follows from $(1.5)_1$ and $(1.5)_2$ that

$$\psi_x = \rho u, \quad \psi_t = \lambda u_x - \rho u^2 - P(\rho) - \frac{b^2}{2}, \quad \psi|_{t=0} = \int_0^x (\rho_0 u_0)(\xi)d\xi, \tag{2.5}$$

and hence, by Lemma 2.1 one has

$$\left|\int_0^1 \psi(x,t)dx\right| \leq C \quad \text{and} \quad \|\psi_x\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^1)} \leq C,$$

which particularly yields

$$\|\psi\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^\infty)} \leq \left|\int_0^1 \psi(x,t)dx\right| + \|\psi_x\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^1)} \leq C. \tag{2.6}$$

Let $D_t \triangleq \partial_t + u\partial_x$ denote the material derivative and set

$$\Phi(x,t) \triangleq \exp\left\{\frac{\psi(x,t)}{\lambda}\right\}. \tag{2.7}$$

Then, by straightforward calculations we have

$$D_t(\rho\Phi) = \partial_t(\rho\Phi) + u\partial_x(\rho\Phi) = -\frac{1}{\lambda}\left(P(\rho) + \frac{b^2}{2}\right)\rho\Phi \leq 0,$$

and consequently,

$$\|(\rho\Phi)(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|(\rho\Phi)(0)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C,$$

which, combined with the fact that $C^{-1} \leq \Phi(x,t) \leq C$ for all $(x,t) \in [0,1] \times [0,T)$ due to (2.6), immediately leads to (2.3). □

Due to lack of dissipation mechanism of the magnetic field and the strong coupling of dynamic motion and magnetic field, the lower boundedness of the density, which relies strongly on the L^∞-norm of magnetic field b, is more difficult to achieve, compared with the upper bound. To circumvent the difficulties, motivated by the mathematical theory of multi-dimensional Navier-Stokes/MHD equations (see, for example, [8, 22, 21]), we introduce the so-called "effective viscous flux" F, which possesses more regularities than the velocity. Define

$$F(x,t) \triangleq \left(\lambda u_x - P(\rho) - \frac{b^2}{2}\right)(x,t) \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{u}(x,t) \triangleq (u_t + uu_x)(x,t), \tag{2.8}$$

where F and " $\dot{}$ " are the "effective viscous flux" and the material derivative, respectively. Thanks to $(1.5)_1$ and $(1.5)_2$, it is easy to see that

$$F_x = \rho(u_t + uu_x) = \rho\dot{u}. \tag{2.9}$$

The quantities of "effective viscous flux" F and material derivative $\dot{u}$ will play an important role in the entire analysis, particularly, in controlling the first-order derivatives of the solutions and studying the vanishing resistivity limit and the boundary layer effects.

In order to estimate the first-order derivative of the velocity, we first need the following preliminary lemma.

Lemma 2.3 *Let F and "$\cdot$" be the same as in (2.8). Then for any $0 \le t < T$,*

$$\frac{\lambda}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 \le \frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 \left(P(\rho) + \frac{b^2}{2}\right) u_x dx + C_1\left(\|F\|_{L^3}^3 + \|b\|_{L^6}^6\right) + C. \tag{2.10}$$

Proof. Multiplying $(1.5)_2$ by $\dot{u}$ in L^2 and integrating by parts, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\lambda}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 u_x^2 dx + \int_0^1 \rho\dot{u}^2 dx = &-\int_0^1 P(\rho)_x(u_t + uu_x)dx \\ &-\frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 (b^2)_x(u_t + uu_x)dx - \frac{\lambda}{2}\int_0^1 u_x^3 dx.\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

Due to $(1.5)_1$, it holds that

$$P(\rho)_t + uP(\rho)_x + \gamma P(\rho)u_x = 0 \quad \text{with} \quad P(\rho) = A\rho^\gamma, \tag{2.12}$$

and hence, the first term on the right-hand side of (2.11) can be estimated as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}-\int_0^1 P(\rho)_x(u_t + uu_x)dx &= \int_0^1 \left(P(\rho)u_{xt} - P(\rho)_x uu_x\right) dx \\ &= \frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 P(\rho)u_x dx - \int_0^1 \left(P(\rho)_t u_x + P(\rho)_x uu_x\right) dx \\ &= \frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 P(\rho)u_x dx + \gamma\int_0^1 P(\rho)u_x^2 dx.\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

Similarly, due to $(1.5)_3$, one has

$$(b^2)_t + u(b^2)_x + 2b^2 u_x = 0, \tag{2.14}$$

so that,

$$\begin{aligned}-\frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 (b^2)_x(u_t + uu_x)dx &= \frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 \left(b^2 u_{xt} - (b^2)_x uu_x\right) dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 b^2 u_x dx - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 \left((b^2)_t u_x + (b^2)_x uu_x\right) dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 b^2 u_x dx + \int_0^1 b^2 u_x^2 dx.\end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

By virtue of (2.3), we infer from (2.8) that

$$|u_x|^3 \le C(1 + |F|^3 + b^6), \quad \forall\ (x,t) \in [0,1] \times [0,T). \tag{2.16}$$

Therefore, substituting (2.13), (2.15) into (2.11), and using (2.3), (2.16) and Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality, we immediately obtain (2.10). $\square$

The next lemma is concerned with the higher integrability of the magnetic field.

Lemma 2.4 *Let F and "$\cdot$" be the same ones defined in (2.8). Then for any $0 \le t < T$,*

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|b\|_{L^4}^4 + \|b\|_{L^6}^6 \le C + C\|F\|_{L^3}^3. \tag{2.17}$$

Proof. Indeed, multiplying $(1.5)_3$ by $4b^3$ and integrating by parts, we get from (2.8) that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 b^4 dx + 3\int_0^1 u_x b^4 dx \\ &= \frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 b^4 dx + \frac{3}{\lambda}\int_0^1 \left(F + P(\rho) + \frac{b^2}{2}\right) b^4 dx \\ &= \frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 b^4 dx + \frac{3}{2\lambda}\int_0^1 b^6 dx + \frac{3}{\lambda}\int_0^1 (F + P(\rho))\, b^4 dx, \end{aligned}$$

which, combined with (2.3) and Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality, leads to (2.17). □

Combining (2.10) with (2.17), we easily obtain

Lemma 2.5 *Let (ρ, u, b) be a smooth solution of (1.5), (1.6) on $[0,1]\times[0,T)$. Then,*

$$\sup_{0\le t<T}\left(\|u_x(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b(t)\|_{L^4}^4\right) + \int_0^T \left(\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b\|_{L^6}^6\right) dt \le C, \tag{2.18}$$

and moreover,

$$\sup_{0\le t<T}\|F(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^T \|F_x\|_{L^2}^2 dt \le C, \tag{2.19}$$

where F and "$\dot{}$" are defined in (2.8).

Proof. Multiplying (2.17) by a (large) number $K \ge \max\{(2\lambda)^{-1}, 2C_1\}$ and adding the resulting inequality to (2.10), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 \left(\frac{\lambda}{4}u_x^2 + \left(K - (4\lambda)^{-1}\right) b^4\right) dx + \int_0^1 \left(\rho\dot{u}^2 + (K - C_1)b^6\right) dx \\ &\le \frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 P(\rho)u_x dx - \frac{1}{4}\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 \left(\sqrt{\lambda}u_x - \frac{b^2}{\sqrt{\lambda}}\right)^2 dx + C\int_0^1 |F|^3 dx + C, \end{aligned}$$

which, integrated over $(0,t)$, gives

$$\left(\|u_x(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b(t)\|_{L^4}^4\right) + \int_0^t \left(\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b\|_{L^6}^6\right) ds \le C + C\int_0^t \|F\|_{L^3}^3 ds, \tag{2.20}$$

since integration of the second term on the right-hand side is non-negative and it follows from (2.3) and Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality that

$$\left|\int_0^1 P(\rho)u_x dx\right| \le \frac{\lambda}{8}\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|P(\rho)\|_{L^2}^2 \le \frac{\lambda}{8}\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 + C.$$

Thanks to Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2, we infer from (2.8) and (2.9) that

$$\begin{cases} \|F\|_{L^1} \le C\left(\|u_x\|_{L^1} + \|\rho\|_{L^\gamma}^\gamma + \|b\|_{L^2}^2\right) \le C\left(1 + \|u_x\|_{L^2}\right), \\ \|F\|_{L^2}^2 \le C\left(1 + \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b\|_{L^4}^4\right), \quad \|F_x\|_{L^2}^2 \le C_2\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2. \end{cases} \tag{2.21}$$

This, together with Sobolev's and Cauchy-Schwarz's inequalities, yields $(0<\varepsilon<1)$

$$\|F\|_{L^3}^3 \le \|F\|_{L^1}\|F\|_{L^\infty}^2 \le C(1 + \|u_x\|_{L^2})\left(\|F\|_{L^2}^2 + \|F\|_{L^2}\|F_x\|_{L^2}\right)$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\le C_2^{-1}\varepsilon\|F_x\|_{L^2}^2 + C\varepsilon^{-1}(1+\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2)\|F\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\le \varepsilon\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + C\varepsilon^{-1}(1+\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2)\left(1+\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2+\|b\|_{L^4}^4\right). \qquad (2.22)
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, substituting (2.22) into (2.20), and choosing $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, by Gronwall's inequality we obtain (2.18), since (2.2) implies that $\|u_x(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \in L^1(0,T)$. As a result, (2.19) follows from (2.21) and (2.18). □

Next, by making a full use of the mathematical structure of "effective viscous flux" F again, we can prove the global boundedness of the magnetic field, and consequently, the lower boundedness of the density can be derived in a manner similar to that used in the derivation of the upper boundedness in Lemma 2.2.

Lemma 2.6 *Let (ρ,u,b) be a smooth solution of (1.5), (1.6) on $[0,1]\times[0,T)$. Then,*

$$
\sup_{0\le t<T}\left(\|b(t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|\rho^{-1}(t)\|_{L^\infty}\right) \le C. \qquad (2.23)
$$

Proof. Multiplying $(1.5)_3$ by $2nb^{2n-1}$ with $1 \le n \in \mathbb{N}$, integrating by parts over $(0,1)$, and recalling the non-negativity of $P(\rho)$ and b^2, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 b^{2n}(x,t)dx &= -(2n-1)\int_0^1 u_x b^{2n}dx \\
&= -\frac{2n-1}{\lambda}\int_0^1\left(F+P(\rho)+\frac{b^2}{2}\right)b^{2n}dx \\
&\le -\frac{2n-1}{\lambda}\int_0^1 Fb^{2n}dx \le Cn\|F\|_{L^\infty}\|b\|_{L^{2n}}^{2n}. \qquad (2.24)
\end{aligned}
$$

It follows from (2.3), (2.9), (2.18), (2.19) and Sobolev's inequality that

$$
\|F\|_{L^\infty}^2 \le C\left(\|F\|_{L^2}^2 + \|F\|_{L^2}\|F_x\|_{L^2}\right) \le C\left(1+\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}\right) \in L^2(0,T), \qquad (2.25)
$$

and hence, by direct calculations we deduce from (2.24) and (2.25) that for $\forall\ t\in[0,T]$,

$$
\|b(t)\|_{L^{2n}}^{2n} \le C^{2n}\exp\left\{Cn\int_0^T\|F\|_{L^\infty}dt\right\} \le C^{2n}\exp\{Cn\},
$$

where C is a positive constant independent of n. Thus, if we raise to the power $1/(2n)$ to both sides and let $n\to\infty$, then we get

$$
\|b(t)\|_{L^\infty} \le C, \quad \forall\ t\in[0,T). \qquad (2.26)
$$

The lower boundedness of the density can be shown in the same way as in Lemma 2.2. Let ψ and Φ be the same functions defined in (2.4) and (2.7), respectively. Analogously to the proof of Lemma 2.2, we find

$$
D_t\left(\frac{1}{\rho\Phi}\right) = \frac{1}{\lambda}\left(P(\rho)+\frac{b^2}{2}\right)\frac{1}{\rho\Phi} \quad \text{with} \quad D_t \triangleq \partial_t + u\partial_x,
$$

so that, using (2.3), (2.6) and (2.26), we have

$$
\left\|(\rho\Phi)^{-1}(t)\right\|_{L^\infty} \le \left\|(\rho\Phi)^{-1}(0)\right\|_{L^\infty}\exp\left\{\frac{1}{\lambda}\int_0^T\left(\|P(\rho)\|_{L^\infty}+\frac{1}{2}\|b\|_{L^\infty}^2\right)dt\right\} \le C,
$$

which, combined with (2.6) again, yields a desired lower bound of the density. □

The next lemma concerns the first-order derivatives of the density and magnetic field.

Lemma 2.7 *Let* (ρ, u, b) *be a smooth solution of (1.5), (1.6) on* $[0,1] \times [0,T)$. *Then,*

$$\sup_{0 \le t < T} \left(\|\rho_x\|_{L^2} + \|b_x\|_{L^2} + \|\rho_t\|_{L^2} + \|b_t\|_{L^2} + \|u\|_{L^\infty} \right)(t) \le C. \tag{2.27}$$

Proof. First, in view of (2.3), (2.8), (2.19), (2.23) and Sobolev's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_x\|_{L^\infty} &\le C \left(\|F\|_{L^\infty} + \|P(\rho)\|_{L^\infty} + \|b^2\|_{L^\infty} \right) \\ &\le C \left(1 + \|F\|_{L^\infty} \right) \le C \left(1 + \|F_x\|_{L^2} \right) \end{aligned} \tag{2.28}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{xx}\|_{L^2} &\le C \left(\|F_x\|_{L^2} + \|P(\rho)_x\|_{L^2} + \|(b^2)_x\|_{L^2} \right) \\ &\le C \left(\|F_x\|_{L^2} + \|\rho_x\|_{L^2} + \|b_x\|_{L^2} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{2.29}$$

Next, if we differentiate $(1.5)_1$, $(1.5)_3$ with respect to x, multiply the resulting equations by ρ_x, b_x in L^2 respectively, and integrate by parts, then we deduce from (2.3), (2.23), (2.28) and (2.29) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt} \left(\|\rho_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b_x\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \\ &\quad \le C \|u_x\|_{L^\infty} \left(\|\rho_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b_x\|_{L^2}^2 \right) + C \|u_{xx}\|_{L^2} \left(\|\rho_x\|_{L^2} + \|b_x\|_{L^2} \right) \\ &\quad \le C \left(1 + \|F_x\|_{L^2} \right) \left(\|\rho_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b_x\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \\ &\qquad + C \left(\|F_x\|_{L^2} + \|\rho_x\|_{L^2} + \|b_x\|_{L^2} \right) \left(\|\rho_x\|_{L^2} + \|b_x\|_{L^2} \right) \\ &\quad \le C \left(1 + \|F_x\|_{L^2} \right) \left(1 + \|\rho_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b_x\|_{L^2}^2 \right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.30}$$

which, combined with (2.19) and Gronwall's inequality, shows

$$\sup_{0 \le t < T} \left(\|\rho_x(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b_x(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \le C.$$

Moreover, it readily follows from $(1.5)_1$ and $(1.5)_3$ that $\|\rho_t(t)\|_{L^2}, \|b_t(t)\|_{L^2}$ are bounded on $[0,T)$, since one easily deduces from (2.2), (2.3), (2.18), (2.23) and Sobolev's inequality that

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^\infty}^2 \le C \left(\|u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u(t)\|_{L^2} \|u_x(t)\|_{L^2} \right) \le C, \quad \forall\, t \in [0,T).$$

The proof of Lemma 2.7 is thus finished. □

Based on Lemmas 2.5–2.7, we can easily derive higher-order estimates for the velocity.

Lemma 2.8 *Let* (ρ, u, b) *be a smooth solution of (1.5), (1.6) on* $[0,1] \times [0,T)$. *Then,*

$$\int_0^T \left(\|u_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u_x\|_{L^\infty}^4 + \|u_t\|_{L^2}^2 \right) dt \le C, \tag{2.31}$$

and moreover,

$$\sup_{0 \le t < T} \left(\|u_{xx}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \right) + \int_0^T \|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2 dt \le C. \tag{2.32}$$

Proof. First, it follows from (2.3), (2.8), (2.9), (2.18), (2.19), (2.23) and (2.27) that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T \left(\|u_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2+\|u_t\|_{L^2}^2\right)dt &\le C\int_0^T \left(\|F_x\|_{L^2}^2+\|P(\rho)_x\|_{L^2}^2+\|(b^2)_x\|_{L^2}^2\right)dt\\ &\quad +C\int_0^T \left(\|\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2+\|u\|_{L^\infty}^2\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2\right)\\ &\le C+C\int_0^T \left(\|F_x\|_{L^2}^2+\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2\right)dt\le C,\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (2.18) and Sobolev's inequality, yields that $\|u_x\|_{L^\infty}^4\in L^1(0,T)$.

To prove (2.32), we differentiate $(1.5)_2$ with respect to t to get

$$\rho u_{tt}+\rho u u_{xt}-\lambda u_{xxt}+\left(P(\rho)+\frac{b^2}{2}\right)_{xt}=-\rho_t(u_t+uu_x)-\rho u_t u_x,$$

which, multiplied by u_t in L^2 and integrated by parts, results in

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 \rho u_t^2dx+\lambda\int_0^1 u_{xt}^2dx\\ &=\int_0^1\left[\left(P(\rho)+\frac{b^2}{2}\right)_t u_{xt}-\rho_t(u_t^2+uu_xu_t)-\rho u_t^2u_x\right]dx\\ &\le C\int_0^1\left[(|\rho_t|+|b_t|)\,|u_{xt}|+|u_t|\left(|\rho_t||u_t|+|\rho_t||u_x|+|u_x||u_t|\right)\right]dx\\ &\le C\left(\|\rho_t\|_{L^2}+\|b_t\|_{L^2}\right)\|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}+C\|u_t\|_{L^\infty}\left(\|u_t\|_{L^2}^2+\|\rho_t\|_{L^2}^2+\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2\right)\\ &\le C\|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}+C\left(\|u_t\|_{L^2}+\|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}\right)\left(1+\|u_t\|_{L^2}^2\right)\\ &\le \frac{\lambda}{2}\|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2+C\left(1+\|u_t\|_{L^2}^4\right),\end{aligned}$$

where the previous lemmas and Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality have been used. Thus, it follows from (2.23), (2.31) and Gronwall's inequality that

$$\sup_{0\le t<T}\|u_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2+\int_0^T\|u_{xt}\|_{L^2}^2dt\le C.$$

As a consequence, using (2.3), (2.18), (2.23) and (2.27), we infer from $(1.5)_2$ that $\|u_{xx}(t)\|_{L^2}$ is bounded on $[0,T)$. The proof of Lemma 2.8 is thus finished. □

Based on the local existence result and the global a-priori estimates established in Lemmas 2.1–2.8, we can prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. As aforementioned, the local-in-time solutions can be obtained via the standard fixed point theorem. Thus, based on the global a-priori estimates established in Lemmas 2.1–2.8, we can extend the local solutions globally in time on $[0,T)$ for any $0<T<\infty$. This proves the global existence of strong solutions. The uniqueness of strong solutions can be easily shown by using the standard L^2-method, and the details are omitted here for simplicity. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is therefore complete. □

3 The vanishing resistivity limit

The global existence of strong solutions to (1.4), (1.10) stated in the first part of Theorem 1.2 can be established in a manner similar to (indeed much easier) that used in [5, 30] by combining the standard local existence result and the global a-priori estimates. Thus, in this section we only focus on the derivation of the uniform bounds stated in (1.12) and (1.13), which will suffice in the study of the vanishing resistivity limit in the second part of Theorem 1.2. To do this, we assume that (ρ, u, b) is a smooth solution of (1.4), (1.10) defined on $[0,1]\times[0,T)$. For simplicity, we also denote by C a generic positive constant, which may depend on λ, A, γ, T, the norms of the initial data $(\rho_0, u_0, b_0)(x)$ and boundary data $(b_1, b_2)(t)$, but is independent of ν.

First, to deal with the boundary effects, we need the following formulas of b_x on the boundaries $x = 0, 1$.

Lemma 3.1 *Let (ρ, u, b) be a smooth solution of (1.4), (1.10) on $[0,1]\times[0,T)$. Then,*

$$\nu b_x(0,t) = \nu\left(b_2(t) - b_1(t)\right) - \partial_t\left[\int_0^1\left(\int_0^x b(\xi,t)d\xi\right)dx\right] - \int_0^1 (ub)(x,t)dx, \tag{3.1}$$

$$\nu b_x(1,t) = \nu\left(b_2(t) - b_1(t)\right) + \partial_t\left[\int_0^1\left(\int_x^1 b(\xi,t)d\xi\right)dx\right] - \int_0^1 (ub)(x,t)dx. \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. First, thanks to the non-slip boundary condition $u|_{x=0} = 0$, we deduce after integrating $(1.4)_3$ over $(0,x)$ that

$$\nu b_x(0,t) = \nu b_x - \partial_t \int_0^x b(\xi,t)d\xi - ub, \tag{3.3}$$

and hence, by integrating (3.3) with respect to x over $(0,1)$, we obtain (3.1).

Similarly, integrating $(1.4)_3$ over $(x,1)$ and using the non-slip boundary condition $u|_{x=1} = 0$ again, we find

$$\nu b_x(1,t) = \nu b_x + \partial_t \int_0^x b(\xi,t)d\xi - ub. \tag{3.4}$$

Thus, an integration of (3.4) with respect to x over $(0,1)$ immediately leads to (3.2). □

In terms of the boundary formulas stated in Lemma 3.1, one can easily derive the elementary energy estimates similar to the ones in Lemma 2.1.

Lemma 3.2 *Let (ρ, u, b) be a smooth solution of (1.4), (1.10) on $[0,1]\times[0,T)$. Then for any $0 \le t < T$,*

$$\int_0^1 \rho(x,t)dx = \int_0^1 \rho_0(x)dx, \tag{3.5}$$

and

$$\int_0^1 \left(\frac{1}{2}\rho u^2 + \frac{1}{2}b^2 + \frac{A}{\gamma-1}\rho^\gamma\right)(x,t)dx + \int_0^t \left(\lambda\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu\|b_x\|_{L^2}^2\right)ds \le C. \tag{3.6}$$

Proof. As a consequence of conservation of mass, one obtains (3.5). To prove (3.6), multiplying $(1.4)_2$, $(1.4)_3$ by u and b in L^2 respectively, integrating by parts over $(0,1)\times(0,t)$ with $0 \le t < T$, and using $(1.4)_1$ and Lemma 3.1, we deduce

$$\int_0^1 \left(\frac{1}{2}\rho u^2 + \frac{1}{2}b^2 + \frac{A}{\gamma-1}\rho^\gamma\right)(x,t)dx + \int_0^t \left(\lambda\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu\|b_x\|_{L^2}^2\right)(x,s)ds$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \int_0^1 \left(\frac{1}{2}\rho_0 u_0^2 + \frac{1}{2}b_0^2 + \frac{A}{\gamma-1}\rho_0^\gamma\right)(x)dx + \int_0^t \nu\left(b_2(s)b_x(1,s) - b_1(s)b_x(0,s)\right)ds \\
&\le C + C\int_0^1 |b(x,t)|dx + C\int_0^t\int_0^1 \left(|b_2'||b| + |b_1'||b| + |u||b|\right)dxds \\
&\le C + C\|b(t)\|_{L^2} + C\int_0^t \left(1+\|u\|_{L^\infty}\right)\|b\|_{L^2}ds \\
&\le C + \frac{1}{4}\|b(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + C\int_0^t \left(1+\|u_x\|_{L^2}\right)\|b\|_{L^2}ds \\
&\le C + \frac{1}{4}\|b(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + C\int_0^t \|b\|_{L^2}^2 ds + \frac{\lambda}{2}\int_0^t \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 ds,
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have also used Hölder's, Sobolev's and Cauchy-Schwarz's inequalities. This, together with Gronwall's inequality, immediately gives (3.6). □

The upper boundedness of the density for the problem (1.4), (1.10) can be obtained in the same manner as in Lemma 2.2, and we have

Lemma 3.3 *Let* (ρ,u,b) *be a smooth solution of (1.4), (1.10) on* $[0,1]\times[0,T)$. *Then,*

$$
0 \le \rho(x,t) \le C, \quad \forall\ (x,t)\in[0,1]\times[0,T). \tag{3.7}
$$

Next, we aim to estimate first-order derivatives of the velocity and derive the higher integrability of the magnetic field stated in Lemma 2.5. We remark that it is more complicated to achieve this due to the additional boundary effects induced by the magnetic diffusion term νb_{xx}. So, to be proceeded, as in Section 2, let "$\dot{}$" be the material derivative $\dot f = f_t + uf_x$ and define

$$
F \triangleq \left(\lambda u_x - P(\rho) - \frac{1}{2}b^2\right)(x,t) \quad \text{with} \quad F_x = \rho\dot u. \tag{3.8}
$$

where (ρ,u,b) is the solution of (1.4), (1.10).

Based on a full use of the " effective viscous flux" F and subtle boundary analysis, we can show the following estimate in a way similar to the proof of Lemma 2.5

Lemma 3.4 *Let* (ρ,u,b) *be a smooth solution of (1.4), (1.10) on* $[0,1]\times[0,T)$. *Then,*

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{0\le t<T}\left(\|u_x(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b(t)\|_{L^4}^4 + \nu\|b_x(t)\|_{L^2}^2\right) \\
&\qquad + \int_0^T \left(\|\rho^{1/2}\dot u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b\|_{L^6}^6 + \nu\|bb_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^2\|b_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2\right)dt \le C.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}
$$

Proof. First, similarly to the derivation of (2.11), (2.13) and (2.15), we deduce from $(1.4)_1$ and $(1.4)_3$ that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\lambda}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 u_x^2 dx + \int_0^1 \rho\dot u^2 dx \\
&\quad = -\int_0^1 P(\rho)_x(u_t+uu_x)dx - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 (b^2)_x(u_t+uu_x)dx - \frac{\lambda}{2}\int_0^1 u_x^3 dx \\
&\quad = \frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1\left(P(\rho)+\frac{b^2}{2}\right)u_x dx + \int_0^1\left(\gamma P(\rho)u_x^2 + b^2u_x^2 - \nu bb_{xx}u_x - \frac{\lambda}{2}u_x^3\right)dx
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\le \frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 \left(P(\rho)+\frac{b^2}{2}\right) u_x dx + \frac{\nu^2}{2}\int_0^1 b_{xx}^2 dx + C\int_0^1 \left(|u_x|^3+b^6\right) dx + C \\
&\le \frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 \left(P(\rho)+\frac{b^2}{2}\right) u_x dx + \frac{\nu^2}{2}\int_0^1 b_{xx}^2 dx + C\int_0^1 \left(|F|^3+b^6\right) dx + C, \qquad (3.10)
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have also used (3.7), (3.8) and Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality.

Secondly, analogously to the proof of (2.17), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 b^4 dx + \frac{3}{2\lambda}\int_0^1 b^6 dx + 12\nu\int_0^1 b^2 b_x^2 dx \\
&\quad = -\frac{3}{\lambda}\int_0^1 (F+P(\rho))\, b^4 dx + 4\nu\left[b_2^3(t) b_x(1,t) - b_1^3(t) b_x(0,t)\right] \\
&\quad \le C + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\int_0^1 b^6 dx + C\int_0^1 |F|^3 dx + R_1(t),
\end{aligned}
$$

and consequently,

$$
\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 b^4 dx + \frac{1}{\lambda}\int_0^1 b^6 dx + 12\nu\int_0^1 b^2 b_x^2 dx \le C + C\int_0^1 |F|^3 dx + R_1(t), \qquad (3.11)
$$

where $R_1(t)$ denotes the boundary term:

$$
R_1(t) \triangleq 4\nu\left[b_2^3(t) b_x(1,t) - b_1^3(t) b_x(0,t)\right].
$$

Moreover, multiplying $(1.4)_3$ by $2\nu b_{xx}$ in L^2 and integrating by parts, we use the non-slip boundary conditions $u|_{x=0,1}=0$ to deduce

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\nu\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 b_x^2 dx + 2\nu^2\int_0^1 b_{xx}^2 dx \\
&\quad = 2\nu\int_0^1 (u_x b + u b_x)\, b_{xx} dx + 2\nu\left[b_2'(t) b_x(1,t) - b_1'(t) b_x(0,t)\right] \\
&\quad = \nu\int_0^1 \left(2u_x b b_{xx} - u_x b_x^2\right) dx + 2\nu\left[b_2'(t) b_x(1,t) - b_1'(t) b_x(0,t)\right]. \qquad (3.12)
\end{aligned}
$$

Due to non-negativity of $P(\rho)$ and b^2, it follows from (3.8) that

$$
-\int_0^1 u_x b_x^2 dx = -\frac{1}{\lambda}\int_0^1 \left(F + P(\rho) + \frac{b^2}{2}\right) b_x^2 dx \le -\frac{1}{\lambda}\int_0^1 F b_x^2 dx,
$$

which, inserted into (3.12) and combined with (3.7), (3.8) and Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality, yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\nu\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 b_x^2 dx + 2\nu^2\int_0^1 b_{xx}^2 dx \\
&\quad \le 2\nu\int_0^1 u_x b b_{xx} dx - \frac{\nu}{\lambda}\int_0^1 F b_x^2 dx + R_2(t) \\
&\quad \le \frac{\nu^2}{2}\int_0^1 b_{xx}^2 dx + C\int_0^1 \left(u_x^3 + b^6 + \nu|F| b_x^2\right) dx + R_2(t)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$\leq \frac{\nu^2}{2}\int_0^1 b_{xx}^2 dx + C + C\int_0^1 \left(F^3 + b^6 + \nu|F|b_x^2\right) dx + R_2(t),$$

where $R_2(t)$ is the boundary term:

$$R_2(t) \triangleq 2\nu \left[b_2'(t)b_x(1,t) - b_1'(t)b_x(0,t)\right].$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\nu\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 b_x^2 dx + \frac{3\nu^2}{2}\int_0^1 b_{xx}^2 dx \leq C + C\int_0^1 \left(F^3 + b^6 + \nu|F|b_x^2\right) dx + R_2(t). \tag{3.13}$$

Adding (3.10) and (3.13) together, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 \left(\frac{\lambda}{2}u_x^2 + \nu b_x^2\right) dx + \int_0^1 \left(\rho\dot{u}^2 + \nu^2 b_{xx}^2\right) dx \\ &\quad\leq \frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 \left(P(\rho) + \frac{b^2}{2}\right) u_x dx + C\int_0^1 \left(F^3 + b^6 + \nu|F|b_x^2\right) dx + R_2(t) + C. \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

Note that it follows from Sobolev's and Young's inequalities that for any $0 \leq t < T$,

$$\begin{aligned} |R_1(t)| + |R_2(t)| &\leq C\nu\|b_x\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\nu\left(\|b_x\|_{L^2} + \|b_x\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|b_{xx}\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\right) \\ &\leq \varepsilon\nu^2\|b_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 + C\varepsilon^{-1}\left(\nu\|b_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^{1/2}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

where $C > 0$ depends on the C^1-norm of $b_1(t)$ and $b_2(t)$, but is independent of $\varepsilon, \nu \in (0,1)$.

Now, multiplying (3.11) a sufficiently large number $K > 0$, adding the resulting inequality to (3.14) and integrating it over $(0,t)$, by (3.15) with $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ being sufficiently small, we deduce in a manner similar to that used in the derivation of (2.20) that for $\forall\ \nu \in (0,1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\|u_x(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b(t)\|_{L^4}^4 + \nu\|b_x(t)\|_{L^2}^2\right) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \left(\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b\|_{L^6}^6 + \nu\|bb_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu^2\|b_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2\right) ds \\ &\leq C + C\int_0^t \|F\|_{L^3}^3 ds + C\nu\int_0^t \|F\|_{L^\infty}\|b_x\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\ &\leq C + C\nu^2\int_0^t \|b_x\|_{L^2}^4 ds + C\int_0^t \left(\|F\|_{L^3}^3 + \|F\|_{L^\infty}^2\right) ds \\ &\leq C + C\nu^2\int_0^t \|b_x\|_{L^2}^4 ds + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\ &\quad + C\int_0^t \left(1 + \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2\right)\left(1 + \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b\|_{L^4}^4\right) ds, \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

where (3.6)–(3.8), Sobolev's, Hölder's and Cauchy-Schwarz's inequalities have been used to get

$$\begin{aligned} \|F\|_{L^3}^3 + \|F\|_{L^\infty}^2 &\leq C\left(1 + \|F\|_{L^1}\right)\left(\|F\|_{L^2}^2 + \|F\|_{L^2}\|F_x\|_{L^2}\right) \\ &\leq C\left(1 + \|u_x\|_{L^2}\right)\left(1 + \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b\|_{L^4}^4\right) \\ &\quad + C\left(1 + \|u_x\|_{L^2}\right)\left(1 + \|u_x\|_{L^2} + \|b\|_{L^4}^2\right)\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + C\left(1 + \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2\right)\left(1 + \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b\|_{L^4}^4\right), \end{aligned}$$

which is analogous to (2.22). As an immediate result of (3.16), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left(\|u_x(t)\|_{L^2}^2+\|b(t)\|_{L^4}^4+\nu\|b_x(t)\|_{L^2}^2\right)\\
&\quad+\int_0^t\left(\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2+\|b\|_{L^6}^6+\nu\|bb_x\|_{L^2}^2+\nu^2\|b_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2\right)ds\\
&\le C+C\nu^2\int_0^t\|b_x\|_{L^2}^4ds+C\int_0^t\left(1+\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2\right)\left(1+\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2+\|b\|_{L^4}^4\right)ds.
\end{aligned}
$$

The above inequality, combined with Gronwall's inequality and the fact that $\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2+\nu\|b_x\|_{L^2}^2\in L^1(0,T)$ due to (3.6), leads to the desired estimate (3.9). □

By virtue of (3.9), the upper boundedness of the magnetic field and the lower boundedness of the density can be obtained in a manner similar to that used in the proof of (2.23).

Lemma 3.5 *Let (ρ,u,b) be a smooth solution of (1.4), (1.10) on $[0,1]\times[0,T)$. Then,*

$$
\sup_{0\le t<T}\left(\|b(t)\|_{L^\infty}+\|\rho^{-1}(t)\|_{L^\infty}\right)\le C. \tag{3.17}
$$

Proof. Similarly to the proof of (2.24), we multiply $(1.4)_3$ by $2nb^{2n-1}$ with $1\le n\in\mathbb{N}$ and integrate by parts over $(0,1)$ to infer, keeping in mind the non-negativity of $P(\rho)$ and b^2, that there exists a positive constant C, independent of n and ν, such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 b^{2n}(x,t)dx+2n(2n-1)\nu\int_0^1 b^{2n-2}b_x^2dx\\
&\quad=-(2n-1)\int_0^1 u_xb^{2n}dx+2n\nu\left[b_2^{2n-1}(t)b_x(1,t)-b_1^{2n-1}(t)b_x(0,t)\right]\\
&\quad\le-\frac{2n-1}{\lambda}\int_0^1\left(F+P(\rho)+\frac{b^2}{2}\right)b^{2n}dx+CnC^{2n}\nu\|b_x\|_{L^\infty}\\
&\quad\le-\frac{2n-1}{\lambda}\int_0^1 Fb^{2n}dx+CnC^{2n}\nu\|b_x\|_{L^\infty}\\
&\quad\le Cn\|F\|_{L^\infty}\|b\|_{L^{2n}}^{2n}+CnC^{2n}\nu\left(\|b_x\|_{L^2}+\|b_x\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|b_{xx}\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\right)\\
&\quad\le Cn\|F\|_{L^\infty}\|b\|_{L^{2n}}^{2n}+CnC^{2n}\left(1+\nu^2\|b_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have used (3.9), Sobolev's and Cauchy-Schwarz's inequalities. Noting that (3.7), together with (3.8) and (3.9), gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|F\|_{L^\infty}^2&\le\|F\|_{L^2}^2+\|F\|_{L^2}\|F_x\|_{L^2}\le C\left(1+\|F_x\|_{L^2}\right)\\
&\le C\left(1+\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}\right)\in L^2(0,T),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}
$$

thus we have by (3.9) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|b(t)\|_{L^{2n}}^{2n}&\le CnC^{2n}\exp\left\{Cn\int_0^T\|F\|_{L^\infty}dt\right\}\int_0^T\left(1+\nu^2\|b_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2dt\right)\\
&\le CnC^{2n}\exp\left\{Cn\right\},
\end{aligned}
$$

from which we conclude that $\|b(t)\|_{L^\infty}\le C$ for all $t\in[0,T)$ by raising to the power $1/(2n)$ to both sides and letting $n\to\infty$. With this at hand, the lower boundedness of the density can be shown exactly in the same way as in Lemma 2.6. The proof of (3.17) is complete. □

The following refined estimates of density and magnetic field play an important role in the analysis of vanishing resistivity limit, and will be also used to deal with the thickness of magnetic boundary layers.

Lemma 3.6 *For any $0<\nu<1$, there exists a positive constant C, independent of ν, such that*

$$\nu^{1/2}\sup_{0\le t<T}\left(\|b_x(t)\|_{L^2}^2+\|\rho_x(t)\|_{L^2}^2\right)+\int_0^T\left(\nu^{3/2}\|b_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2+\nu^{1/2}\|bb_x\|_{L^2}^2\right)dt\le C. \tag{3.19}$$

Proof. Differentiating (1.4) with respect to x, multiplying the resulting equation by $2\rho_x$ in L^2 and integrating by parts, by (3.7), (3.8), (3.17) and (3.18) we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1\rho_x^2dx&=-3\int_0^1u_x\rho_x^2dx-2\int_0^1\rho\rho_xu_{xx}dx\\&=-3\int_0^1u_x\rho_x^2dx-\frac{2}{\lambda}\int_0^1\left(F_x+P_x+bb_x\right)\rho\rho_xdx\\&\le C\left(1+\|u_x\|_{L^\infty}\right)\|\rho_x\|_{L^2}^2+C\left(\|F_x\|_{L^2}+\|\rho_x\|_{L^2}+\|b_x\|_{L^2}\right)\|\rho_x\|_{L^2}\\&\le C\left(1+\|F_x\|_{L^2}\right)\left(\|\rho_x\|_{L^2}^2+\|b_x\|_{L^2}^2\right)+C\left(1+\|F_x\|_{L^2}^2\right),\end{aligned}\tag{3.20}$$

where we have used the following estimate which follows from (3.7), (3.8), (3.17) and (3.18).

$$\|u_x\|_{L^\infty}\le C\left(\|F\|_{L^\infty}+\|P(\rho)\|_{L^\infty}+\|b\|_{L^\infty}^2\right)\le C\left(1+\|F_x\|_{L^2}\right). \tag{3.21}$$

Using the non-slip boundary conditions and integrating by parts, we get from (3.12) that

$$\begin{aligned}\nu\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1b_x^2dx+2\nu^2\int_0^1b_{xx}^2dx&=2\nu\int_0^1\left(u_xb+ub_x\right)b_{xx}dx+R_2(t)\\&=-2\nu\int_0^1u_{xx}bb_xdx-3\nu\int_0^1u_xb_x^2dx+R_2(t)+R_3(t),\end{aligned}\tag{3.22}$$

where $R_2(t)$ is the same as in (3.13) and $R_3(t)$ is also a boundary term denoted by

$$R_3(t)\triangleq 2\nu\left[b_2(t)(u_xb_x)(1,t)-b_1(t)(u_xb_x)(0,t)\right].$$

We are now in a position to bound the terms on the right-hand side of (3.22). First, recalling the definition of F in (3.8), using (3.7) and (3.17), we have

$$\begin{aligned}-2\nu\int_0^1u_{xx}bb_xdx&=-\frac{2\nu}{\lambda}\int_0^1\left(F_x+P(\rho)_x+bb_x\right)bb_xdx\\&\le C\nu\left(\|F_x\|_{L^2}+\|\rho_x\|_{L^2}+\|b_x\|_{L^2}\right)\|b_x\|_{L^2}\\&\le C\nu\left(\|F_x\|_{L^2}^2+\|\rho_x\|_{L^2}^2+\|b_x\|_{L^2}^2\right),\end{aligned}\tag{3.23}$$

and by (3.21) we find

$$-3\nu\int_0^1u_xb_x^2dx\le C\nu\|u_x\|_{L^\infty}\|b_x\|_{L^2}^2\le C\nu\left(1+\|F_x\|_{L^2}\right)\|b_x\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{3.24}$$

Choosing $0<\varepsilon<1$ small enough, we infer from (3.15) that

$$R_2(t)\le\frac{\nu^2}{2}\|b_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2+C\nu\|b_x\|_{L^2}^2+C\nu^{1/2}. \tag{3.25}$$

In order to deal with $R_3(t)$, we observe with the help of (3.21) that

$$|u_x(0,t)| + |u_x(1,t)| \le C\|u_x\|_{L^\infty} \le C\left(1 + \|F_x\|_{L^2}\right),$$

and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} R_3(t) &\le C\nu\left(1 + \|F_x\|_{L^2}\right)\left(\|b_1\|_{C([0,T])} + \|b_2\|_{C([0,T])}\right)\|b_x\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\le C\nu\left(1 + \|F_x\|_{L^2}\right)\left(\|b_x\|_{L^2} + \|b_x\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|b_{xx}\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\right) \\ &\le \frac{\nu^2}{2}\|b_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 + C\nu\|b_x\|_{L^2}^2 + C\left(\nu + \nu^{1/2}\right)\left(1 + \|F_x\|_{L^2}^2\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

Substituting (3.23)–(3.26) into (3.22), we conclude that for any $\nu \in (0,1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu\frac{d}{dt}\|b_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \left(\nu^2\|b_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu\|bb_x\|_{L^2}^2\right) \\ &\quad \le C\nu\left(\|b_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\rho_x\|_{L^2}^2\right)\left(1 + \|F_x\|_{L^2}\right) + C\nu^{1/2}\left(1 + \|F_x\|_{L^2}^2\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

Now, multiplying (3.20) by ν and adding the resulting inequality to (3.27), we obtain that for any $0 < \nu < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu\frac{d}{dt}\left(\|\rho_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b_x\|_{L^2}^2\right) + \nu^2\|b_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad \le C\nu\left(\|\rho_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \|b_x\|_{L^2}^2\right)\left(1 + \|F_x\|_{L^2}\right) + C\nu^{1/2}\left(1 + \|F_x\|_{L^2}^2\right), \end{aligned}$$

which, combined with (3.9), (3.18) and Gronwall's inequality, implies

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu\sup_{0\le t\le T}\left(\|b_x\|_{L^2}^2 + \|P(\rho)_x\|_{L^2}^2\right) + \int_0^T\left(\nu^2\|b_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu\|bb_x\|_{L^2}^2\right)dt \\ &\quad \le C\nu^{1/2}\exp\left\{\int_0^T\left(1 + \|F_x\|_{L^2}\right)dt\right\}\int_0^T\left(1 + \|F_x\|_{L^2}^2\right)dt \\ &\quad \le C\nu^{1/2}\exp\left\{\int_0^T\left(1 + \|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}\right)dt\right\}\int_0^T\left(1 + \|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2\right)dt \\ &\quad \le C\nu^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

which immediately leads to the desired estimate (3.19). □

With the estimates established in Lemmas 2.1–2.8 and 3.2–3.6 at hand, we are now ready to prove the second part of Theorem 1.2.

Proof of (ii)-Theorem 1.2. Let (ρ^ν, u^ν, b^ν) and (ρ, u, b) be the solutions to the initial-boundary value problems (1.4), (1.10) and (1.5), (1.6), respectively. Then, by a straightforward calculation we find that $(\rho^\nu - \rho, u^\nu - u, b^\nu - b)$ satisfies

$$(\rho^\nu - \rho)_t + (\rho^\nu - \rho)\, u_x^\nu + \rho\,(u^\nu - u)_x + (\rho^\nu - \rho)_x\, u^\nu + \rho_x\,(u^\nu - u) = 0, \tag{3.28}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^\nu\,(u^\nu - u)_t + \rho^\nu u^\nu\,(u^\nu - u)_x - \lambda\,(u^\nu - u)_{xx} &= -\,(\rho^\nu - \rho)\,u_t - (\rho^\nu - \rho)\,uu_x \\ &\quad - \rho^\nu\,(u^\nu - u)\,u_x - \left[P(\rho^\nu) - P(\rho)\right]_x - \frac{1}{2}\left[(b^\nu)^2 - b^2\right]_x, \end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

and

$$(b^\nu - b)_t + u^\nu_x (b^\nu - b) + b (u^\nu - u)_x + u^\nu (b^\nu - b)_x + (u^\nu - u) b_x = \nu b^\nu_{xx}. \tag{3.30}$$

First, multiplying (3.30) by $2(b^\nu - b)$ in L^2 and integrating by parts, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\|b^\nu - b\|^2_{L^2} = &-\int_0^1 u^\nu_x (b^\nu - b)^2\, dx - 2\int_0^1 b (u^\nu - u)_x (b^\nu - b)\, dx \\ &-2\int_0^1 (u^\nu - u) b_x (b^\nu - b)\, dx + 2\nu \int_0^1 b^\nu_{xx} (b^\nu - b)\, dx \\ &\triangleq I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4. \end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

On one hand, using (2.23), (2.27), (3.18), (3.21) and Sobolev's inequality, we can control the first three terms on the right-hand side of (3.31) as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^3 I_i &\le C\|u^\nu_x\|_{L^\infty}\|b^\nu - b\|^2_{L^2} + C\|b\|_{L^\infty}\|(u^\nu - u)_x\|_{L^2}\|b^\nu - b\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + \|b_x\|_{L^2}\|u^\nu - u\|_{L^\infty}\|b^\nu - b\|_{L^2} \\ &\le C\left(1 + \|\sqrt{\rho^\nu}\dot{u}^\nu\|_{L^2}\right)\|b^\nu - b\|^2_{L^2} + C\|(u^\nu - u)_x\|_{L^2}\|b^\nu - b\|_{L^2} \\ &\le \varepsilon\|(u^\nu - u)_x\|^2_{L^2} + C\varepsilon^{-1}\left(1 + \|\sqrt{\rho^\nu}\dot{u}^\nu\|_{L^2}\right)\|b^\nu - b\|^2_{L^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.32}$$

On the other hand, by (2.23), (2.27) and Young's inequality we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} I_4 &= -2\nu\int_0^1 b^\nu_x (b^\nu_x - b_x)\, dx + 2\nu\left[b^\nu_x(b^\nu - b)(1,t) - b^\nu_x(b^\nu - b)(0,t)\right] \\ &\le -2\nu\|b^\nu_x\|^2_{L^2} + 2\nu\|b^\nu_x\|_{L^2}\|b_x\|_{L^2} + C\nu\left(\|b\|_{L^\infty} + \|(b_1, b_2)\|_{C([0,T])}\right)\|b^\nu_x\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\le -\nu\|b^\nu_x\|^2_{L^2} + C\nu + C\nu\left(\|b^\nu_x\|_{L^2} + \|b^\nu_x\|^{1/2}_{L^2}\|b^\nu_{xx}\|^{1/2}_{L^2}\right) \\ &\le -\frac{\nu}{2}\|b^\nu_x\|^2_{L^2} + C\nu^2\|b^\nu_{xx}\|^2_{L^2} + C\nu^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.33}$$

Putting (3.32) and (3.33) into (3.31), we obtain $(0 < \varepsilon < 1)$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\|b^\nu - b\|^2_{L^2} + \nu\|b^\nu_x\|^2_{L^2} \le\, & C\left(\nu^{1/2} + \nu^2\|b^\nu_{xx}\|^2_{L^2}\right) + \varepsilon\|(u^\nu - u)_x\|^2_{L^2} \\ & + C\varepsilon^{-1}\left(1 + \|\sqrt{\rho^\nu}\dot{u}^\nu\|_{L^2}\right)\|b^\nu - b\|^2_{L^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.34}$$

Similarly, multiplying (3.28) by $2(\rho^\nu - \rho)$ in L^2, integrating by parts, and using Lemmas 2.2–2.8, (3.18), (3.21) and Sobolev's inequality, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\|\rho^\nu - \rho\|^2_{L^2} &\le C\|u^\nu_x\|_{L^\infty}\|\rho^\nu - \rho\|^2_{L^2} + C\|\rho\|_{L^\infty}\|(u^\nu - u)_x\|_{L^2}\|\rho^\nu - \rho\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + \|\rho_x\|_{L^2}\|u^\nu - u\|_{L^\infty}\|\rho^\nu - \rho\|_{L^2} \\ &\le C\left(1 + \|\sqrt{\rho^\nu}\dot{u}^\nu\|_{L^2}\right)\|\rho^\nu - \rho\|^2_{L^2} + C\|(u^\nu - u)_x\|_{L^2}\|\rho^\nu - \rho\|_{L^2} \\ &\le \varepsilon\|(u^\nu - u)_x\|^2_{L^2} + C\varepsilon^{-1}\left(1 + \|\sqrt{\rho^\nu}\dot{u}^\nu\|_{L^2}\right)\|\rho^\nu - \rho\|^2_{L^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.35}$$

Finally, multiplying (3.29) by $2(u^\nu - u)$ in L^2 and integrating by parts, by virtue of Lemmas 2.2–2.8, (3.7), (3.17) and Sobolev's inequality again, we see that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\sqrt{\rho^\nu}(u^\nu - u)\|^2_{L^2} + 2\lambda\|(u^\nu - u)_x\|^2_{L^2}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\leq C\left(\|u_t\|_{L^2}+\|u\|_{L^\infty}\|u_x\|_{L^2}\right)\|\rho^\nu-\rho\|_{L^2}\|u^\nu-u\|_{L^\infty}+C\|u_x\|_{L^\infty}\|\sqrt{\rho^\nu}(u^\nu-u)\|_{L^2}^2\\
&\quad+C\left(\|P(\rho^\nu)-P(\rho)\|_{L^2}+\|(b^\nu)^2-b^2\|_{L^2}\right)\|(u^\nu-u)_x\|_{L^2}\\
&\leq C\left(\|\rho^\nu-\rho\|_{L^2}+\|b^\nu-b\|_{L^2}\right)\|(u^\nu-u)_x\|_{L^2}+C\|u_x\|_{L^\infty}\|\sqrt{\rho^\nu}(u^\nu-u)\|_{L^2}^2\\
&\leq \varepsilon\|(u^\nu-u)_x\|_{L^2}^2+C\varepsilon^{-1}\left(\|\rho^\nu-\rho\|_{L^2}^2+\|b^\nu-b\|_{L^2}^2\right)\\
&\quad+C\left(\|u_x\|_{L^2}+\|u_{xx}\|_{L^2}\right)\|\sqrt{\rho^\nu}(u^\nu-u)\|_{L^2}^2\\
&\leq \varepsilon\|(u^\nu-u)_x\|_{L^2}^2+C\varepsilon^{-1}\left(\|\rho^\nu-\rho\|_{L^2}^2+\|b^\nu-b\|_{L^2}^2\right)+C\|\sqrt{\rho^\nu}(u^\nu-u)\|_{L^2}^2. \qquad (3.36)
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, putting (3.34), (3.35) and (3.36) together, taking $\varepsilon>0$ suitably small, we arrive at

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}\left(\|\rho^\nu-\rho\|_{L^2}^2+\|b^\nu-b\|_{L^2}^2+\|\sqrt{\rho^\nu}(u^\nu-u)\|_{L^2}^2\right)+\|(u^\nu-u)_x\|_{L^2}^2+\nu\|b_x^\nu\|_{L^2}^2\\
&\quad\leq C\left(1+\|\sqrt{\rho^\nu}\dot{u}^\nu\|_{L^2}\right)\left(\|\rho^\nu-\rho\|_{L^2}^2+\|b^\nu-b\|_{L^2}^2+\|\sqrt{\rho^\nu}(u^\nu-u)\|_{L^2}^2\right)\\
&\quad\quad+C\left(\nu^{1/2}+\nu^2\|b_{xx}^\nu\|_{L^2}^2\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

which, combined with (3.9), (3.19) and Gronwall's inequality, yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{0\leq t<T}\left(\|\rho^\nu-\rho\|_{L^2}^2+\|b^\nu-b\|_{L^2}^2+\|\sqrt{\rho^\nu}(u^\nu-u)\|_{L^2}^2\right)(t)\\
&\quad+\int_0^T\left(\|(u^\nu-u)_x\|_{L^2}^2+\nu\|b_x^\nu\|_{L^2}^2\right)dt\leq C\nu^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}
$$

This inequality, together with the strictly positive lower bound of density due to (3.17), justifies the vanishing resistivity limit stated in the second part of Theorem 1.2. □

4 The thickness of magnetic boundary layers

This section is concerned with the thickness of magnetic boundary layers. As aforementioned in Section 1, to simplify the analysis, we assume that the one-dimensional compressible isentropic viscous and non-resistive MHD system (1.5) is equipped with the specific initial and boundary data as follows:

$$
(\rho,u,b)|_{t=0}=(\overline{\rho},0,0)\quad\text{and}\quad u|_{x=0,1}=0, \qquad (4.1)
$$

where $\overline{\rho}\equiv$ const. is a positive constant. Then thanks to the uniqueness result, we conclude that the initial-boundary value problem (1.5), (4.1) has only a trivial solution:

$$
(\rho,u,b)(x,t)=(\overline{\rho},0,0),\quad (x,t)\in[0,1]\times[0,T). \qquad (4.2)
$$

This particularly finishes the proof of the first part of Theorem 1.3.

To prove the second part of Theorem 1.3, we consider an initial-boundary value problem for (1.4) with initial and boundary data:

$$
(\rho,u,b)|_{t=0}=(\overline{\rho},0,0),\quad u|_{x=0,1}=0,\quad b(0,t)=b_1(t)\quad\text{and}\quad b(1,t)=b_2(t), \qquad (4.3)
$$

where $\overline{\rho}\equiv$ const. >0 and $b_1(t),b_2(t)$ are the same as in (4.1) and (1.10), respectively. In the following, for simplicity but without any confusion, we denote by (ρ,u,b) the solution of the problem (1.4), (4.3).

Remark 4.1 *It is worth mentioning that all the uniform estimates established in Section 3 also hold for the solution (ρ,u,b) of the problem (1.4), (4.3).*

In order to study the thickness of magnetic boundary layers, we need to utilize the trivial solution (4.2) of the problem (1.5), (4.1), the specific initial data in (4.3) and the convergence rates in (1.14) to obtain the following improved estimates.

Lemma 4.1 *Let (ρ, u, b) be a smooth solution of (1.4), (4.3) on $[0,1]\times[0,T)$. Then there exists a positive constant $C>0$, independent of ν, such that*

$$\sup_{0\le t<T}\left(\|\rho-\overline{\rho}\|_{L^2}^2+\|b\|_{L^2}^2+\|u\|_{L^2}^2\right)(t)+\int_0^T\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2dt\le C\nu^{1/2}, \tag{4.4}$$

$$\sup_{0\le t<T}\|u_x(t)\|_{L^2}^2+\int_0^T\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2dt\le C\nu^{1/2}. \tag{4.5}$$

Proof. As an immediate consequence of (1.14) and (4.2), one obtains (4.4).

To prove (4.5), similar to the derivation of $(3.10)_3$, we get from (3.7) and (3.17) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\lambda}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 u_x^2dx+\int_0^1\rho\dot{u}^2dx\\
&=\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1\left(P(\rho)+\frac{1}{2}b^2\right)u_xdx+\int_0^1\left(\gamma P(\rho)u_x^2+b^2u_x^2-\nu bb_{xx}u_x-\frac{\lambda}{2}u_x^3\right)dx\\
&\le\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1\left(P(\rho)-P(\overline{\rho})+\frac{1}{2}b^2\right)u_xdx+C\left(1+\|u_x\|_{L^\infty}\right)\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2+C\nu^2\|b_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2,
\end{aligned}\tag{4.6}$$

where we have also used the non-slip boundary conditions $u|_{x=0,1}=0$.

Due to the vanishing initial data given in (4.3), we have

$$\int_0^1\left(P(\rho)-P(\overline{\rho})+\frac{1}{2}b^2\right)u_xdx\Big|_{t=0}=0, \tag{4.7}$$

and by (3.7), (3.17) and (4.4), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\int_0^1\left(P(\rho)-P(\overline{\rho})+\frac{1}{2}b^2\right)u_xdx\right|&\le C\left(\|\rho-\overline{\rho}\|_{L^2}+\|b\|_{L^2}\right)\|u_x\|_{L^2}\\
&\le\frac{\lambda}{4}\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2+C\left(\|\rho-\overline{\rho}\|_{L^2}^2+\|b\|_{L^2}^2\right)\\
&\le\frac{\lambda}{4}\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2+C\nu^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.8}$$

Thus, by virtue of (4.7), (4.8) and (3.19) we deduce after integrating (4.6) over $(0,t)$ that for any $0\le t<T$,

$$\|u_x(t)\|_{L^2}^2+\int_0^t\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2ds\le C\nu^{1/2}+C\int_0^t\|u_x\|_{L^\infty}\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2ds,$$

which, together with (3.18), (3.21) and Gronwall's inequality, gives (4.5). □

The analysis of the thickness of magnetic boundary layers relies on the following weighted (interior) L^2-estimate of the density and magnetic field.

Lemma 4.2 *Let (ρ, u, b) be a smooth solution of (1.4), (4.3) on $[0,1]\times[0,T)$. Then there exists a positive constant $C>0$, independent of ν, such that*

$$\sup_{0\le t<T}\int_0^1 \xi(x)\left(|\rho_x|^2+|b_x|^2\right)(x,t)dx \le C\nu^{1/2}, \tag{4.9}$$

where $\xi(x)\triangleq x^2(1-x)^2$.

Proof. Differentiating $(1.4)_3$ with respect to x gives

$$b_{xt}-\nu b_{xxx}=-ub_{xx}-2u_xb_x-u_{xx}b,$$

which, multiplied by $b_x\xi(x)$ in L^2 and integrated by parts, yields

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 b_x^2\xi(x)dx+\nu\int_0^1 b_{xx}^2\xi(x)dx\\ &\quad=\frac{\nu}{2}\int_0^1 b_x^2\xi''(x)dx+\frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 ub_x^2\xi'(x)dx\\ &\quad-\frac{3}{2}\int_0^1 u_xb_x^2\xi(x)dx-\int_0^1 u_{xx}bb_x\xi(x)dx\triangleq\sum_{i=1}^4 I_i,\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

where we have used the fact that $\xi(x)=\xi'(x)=0$ on the boundaries $x=0,1$.

We are now in a position of estimating each term on the right-hand side of (4.10). First, it readily follows from (3.19) that

$$I_1\le C\nu\|b_x\|_{L^2}^2\le C\nu^{1/2}. \tag{4.11}$$

Noting that due to the non-slip boundary conditions $u|_{x=0,1}=0$ and (4.5) (also cf. (3.9)), one has

$$\begin{aligned}&u(x,t)=\int_0^x u_x(x,t)dx\le Cx\|u_x\|_{L^\infty},\quad \forall\ x\in[0,1]\\ &u(x,t)=-\int_x^1 u_x(x,t)dx\le C(1-x)\|u_x\|_{L^\infty},\quad \forall\ x\in[0,1],\end{aligned}$$

so that, by (3.18) and (3.21), we have

$$\begin{aligned}I_2&=\int_0^1 ub_x^2\left[x(1-x)^2-x^2(1-x)\right]dx\\ &\le C\|u_x\|_{L^\infty}\int_0^1 b_x^2\xi(x)dx\\ &\le C\left(1+\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}\right)\int_0^1 b_x^2\xi(x)dx.\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

Similarly,

$$I_3\le C\|u_x\|_{L^\infty}\int_0^1 b_x^2\xi(x)dx\le C\left(1+\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}\right)\int_0^1 b_x^2\xi(x)dx. \tag{4.13}$$

Finally, recalling that

$$u_{xx} = \lambda^{-1}\left(F_x + P(\rho)_x + bb_x\right), \quad F_x = \rho\dot{u},$$

and using (3.7), (3.17) and Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality, we infer from (3.8) that

$$\begin{aligned} I_4 &= -\lambda^{-1}\int_0^1 \left(F_x + P(\rho)_x + bb_x\right) bb_x\xi(x)dx \\ &\le C\int_0^1 \left(|F_x| + |\rho_x| + |b_x|\right)|b_x|\xi(x)dx \\ &\le C\|F_x\|_{L^2}^2 + C\int_0^1 \left(\rho_x^2 + b_x^2\right)\xi(x)dx \\ &\le C\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + C\int_0^1 \left(\rho_x^2 + b_x^2\right)\xi(x)dx. \end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

Thus, inserting (4.11)–(4.14) into (4.10), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 b_x^2\xi(x)dx + \nu\int_0^1 b_{xx}^2\xi(x)dx \\ &\quad\le C\left(\nu^{1/2} + \|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2\right) + C\left(1 + \|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}\right)\int_0^1 \left(\rho_x^2 + b_x^2\right)\xi(x)dx. \end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

In a similar manner, differentiating $(1.4)_1$ with respect to x, multiplying it by $\rho_x\xi(x)$ in L^2, and integrating by parts, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 \rho_x^2\xi(x)dx &= \frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 u\rho_x^2\xi'(x)dx - \frac{3}{2}\int_0^1 u_x\rho_x^2\xi(x)dx - \int_0^1 u_{xx}\rho\rho_x\xi(x)dx \\ &\le C\|F_x\|_{L^2}^2 + C\left(1 + \|u_x\|_{L^\infty}\right)\int_0^1 \left(\rho_x^2 + b_x^2\right)\xi(x)dx \\ &\le C\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + C\left(1 + \|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}\right)\int_0^1 \left(\rho_x^2 + b_x^2\right)\xi(x)dx, \end{aligned}$$

which, combined with (4.15), shows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 \left(\rho_x^2 + b_x^2\right)\xi(x)dx + \nu\int_0^1 b_{xx}^2\xi(x)dx \\ &\quad\le C\left(\nu^{1/2} + \|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2\right) + C\left(1 + \|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}\right)\int_0^1 \left(\rho_x^2 + b_x^2\right)\xi(x)dx. \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

Therefore, by virtue of (4.5), we deduce from (4.16) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{0\le t\le T}\int_0^1 \xi(x)\left(\rho_x^2 + b_x^2\right)(x,t)dx + \nu\int_0^T\int_0^1 \xi(x)b_{xx}^2(x,t)dxdt \\ &\quad\le C\left(\nu^{1/2} + \int_0^T \|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2dt\right)\exp\left\{C\int_0^T \left(1 + \|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}\right)dt\right\} \\ &\quad\le C\nu^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of (4.9) is complete. □

With the help of (4.4) and (4.9), we can estimate the thickness of magnetic boundary layers.

Proof of (ii)-Theorem 1.3. On one hand, by (4.9) we observe that for any $\delta \in (0,1/2)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\delta^2 \int_\delta^{1-\delta} \left(\rho_x^2 + b_x^2\right)(x,t)dx \\
&= \delta^2 \int_\delta^{1/2} \left(\rho_x^2 + b_x^2\right)(x,t)dx + \delta^2 \int_{1/2}^{1-\delta} \left(\rho_x^2 + b_x^2\right)(x,t)dx \\
&\le \int_\delta^{1/2} x^2 \left(\rho_x^2 + b_x^2\right)(x,t)dx + \int_{1/2}^{1-\delta} (1-x)^2 \left(\rho_x^2 + b_x^2\right)(x,t)dx \\
&\le 4\int_\delta^{1/2} x^2(1-x)^2 \left(\rho_x^2 + b_x^2\right)(x,t)dx + 4\int_{1/2}^{1-\delta} x^2(1-x)^2 \left(\rho_x^2 + b_x^2\right)(x,t)dx \\
&\le 4\int_\delta^{1-\delta} x^2(1-x)^2 \left(\rho_x^2 + b_x^2\right)(x,t)dx \le C\nu^{1/2},
\end{aligned}$$

from which it follows that for any $\delta \in (0,1/2)$,

$$\|\rho_x(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)} + \|b_x(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)} \le C\delta^{-1}\nu^{1/4}, \quad \forall\, t \in [0,T), \tag{4.17}$$

where $\Omega_\delta \triangleq (\delta, 1-\delta)$. Thus, in view of (4.4) and (4.17), we have by Sobolev's inequality that for any $t \in [0,T)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(\rho-\overline{\rho})(t)\|^2_{C(\overline{\Omega}_\delta)} + \|b(t)\|^2_{C(\overline{\Omega}_\delta)} \\
&\quad\le C\left(\|(\rho-\overline{\rho})(t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)} + \|b(t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)}\right) \\
&\qquad + C\left(\|(\rho-\overline{\rho})(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)}\|\rho_x(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)} + \|b(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)}\|b_x(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)}\right) \\
&\quad\le C\left(\|(\rho-\overline{\rho})(t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|b(t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\right) \\
&\qquad + C\left(\|(\rho-\overline{\rho})(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\rho_x(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)} + \|b(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|b_x(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)}\right) \\
&\quad\le C\nu^{1/2} + C\nu^{1/2}\delta^{-1} \le C\nu^{1/2}\delta^{-1} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \nu \to 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

provided $\delta = \delta(\nu)$ satisfies

$$\delta(\nu) \to 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\delta(\nu)}{\nu^{1/2}} \to \infty, \quad \text{as} \quad \nu \to 0.$$

On the other hand, it is easy to see that

$$\liminf_{\nu\to 0}\left(\|(\rho-\overline{\rho})(t)\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;C(\overline{\Omega}))} + \|b(t)\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;C(\overline{\Omega}))}\right) > 0,$$

provided the boundary data $b_1(t), b_2(t)$ are not identically zero (i.e., $b_1(t), b_2(t) \neq 0$). This, together with (4.18), proves the second part of Theorem 1.3. □

References

[1] J.A. Bittencourt, *Fundamentals of Plasma Physics 3rd.* New York: Spinger-Verlag, 2004.

[2] T.J.M. Boyd, J.J. Sanderson, *The Physics of Plasmas.* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2003.

[3] H. Cabannes, *Theoretical Magnetofluiddynamics.* New York: Academic Press, 1970.

[4] S. Chandrasekhar, *Hydrodynamic and Hydromagnetic Stability.* Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1961.

[5] G.-Q. Chen, D. Wang, Global solutions of nonlinear magnetohydrodynamics with large initial data. J. Diff. Eqns., **182** (2002), 344-376.

[6] S. Evje, Weak solutions for a gas-liquid model relevant for describing gas-kick in oil wells. SIAM J. Math. Anal., **43**(4) (2011), 1887-1922.

[7] J.S. Fan, S. Jiang, G. Nakamura, Vanishing shear viscosity limit in the magnetohydrodynamic equations. Commun. Math. Phys., **270** (2007), 691-708.

[8] E. Feireisl, A. Novotný, H. Petzeltová, On the existence of globally defined weak solutions for the Navier-Stokes equations of isentropic compressible fluids. J. Math. Fluid Mech., **3** (2001), 358-392.

[9] J.P. Freidberg, *Ideal Magnetohydrodynamic Theory of Magnetic Fusion Systems.* Rev. Modern Physics Vol. 54, No 3, The American Physical Society, 1982.

[10] H. Frid, V.V. Shelukhin, Boundary layer for the Navier-Stokes equations of compressible fluids. Commun. Math. Phys., **208** (1999), 309-330.

[11] H. Frid, V.V. Shelukhin, Boundary layers in parabolic perturbation of scalar conservation laws. Z. Angew. Math. Phys., **55** (2004), 420-434.

[12] R. M. Gunderson, *Linearized Analysis of One-Dimensional Magnetohydrodynamic Flows.* Springer Tracts in Natural Philosophy, Vol. 1. Springer-Verlag, Berlin. Gottingen. Heidelberg. New York, 1964.

[13] D.A. Gurnett, A. Bhattacharjee, *Introduction to Plasma Physics.* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2005.

[14] R.D. Hazeltine, J.D. Meiss, *Plasma Confinement.* Addison-Wesley, 1992.

[15] S. Jiang, J.W. Zhang, Boundary layers for the Navier-Stokes equations of compressible heat-conducting flows with cylindrical symmetry. SIAM J. Math. Anal., **41**(1) (2009), 237-268.

[16] S. Jiang, J.W. Zhang, J.N. Zhao, Boundary-layer effects for the 2-D Boussinesq equations with vanishing diffusivity limit in the half plane. J. Diff. Eqns., **250** (2011) 3907-3936.

[17] Kazhikhov, A.V., Smagulov, Sh.S.: Well-posedness and approximation methods for a model of magnetogasdynamics. Izv. Akad. Nauk. Kazakh. SSR Ser. Fiz.-Mat., **5**, 17-19 (1986)

[18] A.F. Kulikovskiy, G.A. Lyubimov, *Magnetohydrodynamics.* Reading MA: Addison-Wasley, 1965.

[19] L.D. Landau, E.M. Lifshitz, L.P. Pitaevskii, *Electrodynamics of Continuous Media*, 2nd ed., London: Butterworth-Heinemann, 1999.

[20] L.D. Landau, E.M. Lifshitz, *Fluid Mechanics*, 2nd ed., Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1987.

[21] H.L. Li, X.Y. Xu, J.W. Zhang, Global classsical solutions to 3D compressible magnetohydrodynamic equations with large oscillations and vacuum. SIAM J. Math. Anal., **45** (2013), 1356-1387.

[22] P.-L. Lions, *Mathematical Topics in Fluid Dynamics*, Vol. **2**, Compressible Models. Oxford: Oxford Science Publication, 1996.

[23] A. Matsumura, T. Nishida, The initial value problem for the equations of motion of viscous and heat-conductive gases. J. Math. Kyoto Univ., **20** (1980), 67-104.

[24] O.A. Oleinik, E.V. Radkevic, *Second Order Equations with Nonnegative Characteristic Form.* American Mathematical Society, Rhode Island and Plenum Press, New York, 1973.

[25] O.A. Oleinik, V.N. Samokhin, *Mathematical Models in Boundary Layer.* Chapman & Hall/CRC, London, 1999.

[26] H. Schlichting, *Boundary Layer Theory*, 7th ed., McGraw-Hill Company, London-New York, 1987.

[27] L.C. Woods, *Priciples of Magnetoplasma Dynamics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

[28] X.Y. Xu, J.W. Zhang, A blow-up criterion for 3D non-resistive compressible magnetohydrodynamic equations with initial vacuum. Nonlinear Anal., RWA., **12** (2011), 3442-3451.

[29] L. Yao, C.J. Zhu, Existence and uniqueness of global weak solution to a two-phase flow model with vacuum. Math. Ann., **349**(4) (2011), 903-928.

[30] J.W. Zhang, F. Xie, Global solution for a one-dimensional model problem in thermally radiative magnetohydrodynamics. J. Diff. Eqns., **245** (2008), 1853-1882.